DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 083 CS 211 022

AUTHOR Riggar, T. F.; Smith, Edward R.
TITLE Annotations in Academic Publishing.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 55p.
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Authors; Editing; *Faculty Publishing; *Publications; Publishing Industry; Research Reports; Scholarly Journals; Technical Writing; Textbook Preparation; *Writing for Publication; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Professional Literature; Published Reading Materials; Scholarly Writing; Writing Development

ABSTRACT

Intended to aid new academic professionals, this annotated bibliography lists a wide variety of books and articles, from the very general to the very specific, that deal with professional academic writing and publishing. Arranged alphabetically by author, each of the 225 annotations supplies a brief summary of the contents and date of publication, and cites the publisher, journal title, and page numbers when appropriate. (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED292083

ANNOTATIONS

IN

ACADEMIC PUBLISHING

T.F. Riggar

Edward R. Smith

CHR-WPC #456

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. F. Riggar

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS 211 022

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ANNOTATIONS IN ACADEMIC PUBLISHING

For many new or inexperienced academic professionals, writing appears to be an exciting venture which is or will soon be a part of their job. Composed of a unique combination of scholarly and scientific scrutiny and the established publication and dissemination process, a bewildering variety of avenues are seemingly available to follow. Unfortunately those who have attempted to engage in scholarly writing without guidance and assistance are often left frustrated, dejected, and rejected.

Those individuals who receive a masters and continue their education to be granted a doctorate are experienced and knowledgeable in a specific field. It is odd that one will spend years learning physics, psychology, geology or anthropology and fail to realize that expertise in the field does not automatically confer academic writing potential on them. Professional academic writing is as separate an arena as any of the others and one rarely taught as part of, or in conjunction with, most advanced degrees (Boice & Johnson, 1984). The facilitation of graduate students' writing efforts through seminars, workshops, classes and even mentoring is a rare commodity in academia (Greaser, 1979; O'Brien & Johnson, 1980; Reitt, 1980). For the most part however aspiring authors turn to a wide variety of books and articles, from the very general to the very specific, to hope to learn about writing and publishing. The best of these materials have been examined and annotated and can be found in this Annotated Bibliography.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelman, R.H. (1972).
What's really involved in writing and selling your book. Los Angeles, CA: Nash Publishing.

Contains an excellent section on how to develop an outline (precis) for publishers.

Aleamoni, L.M., & Yimer, M. (1973).
An investigation of the relationship between colleague rating, student rating, research productivity, and academic rank in rating instructional effectiveness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 64(3), 274-277.

A total of 477 University of Illinois faculty were studied in the fall of 1969-1970. The examination found that academic publications are more highly related to academic rank than to peer or student ratings or gender.

Alemna, A.A. (1982).
Scholary publishing in Ghana.
Scholary Publishing, 13(2), 174-178.

Despite facing many problems ranging from finances, lack of trained writers, marketing, distribution, and politics, the state supported Ghana Publishing Corporation and Universities of Ghana Press have reduced its country's dependence on imported books.

Alexander, J.J., & Wall, J. (1975).
Righting the wrongs of writing: Copy editors speak out.
Personnel and Guidance Journal, 53(10), 768-773.

Reviews the main errors made by authors, giving specific amusing examples. Discusses style and readability: short and sweet says it best, writing in action/action in writing, and the medium, the message, the medium. Also comments on grammar and syntax.

Alley, B., & Cargill, J. (1986).
Librarian in search of a publisher: How to get published. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx.

A specialized text which examines, from a how-to perspective, academic publishing for college and university librarians. Although many sections are based wholly on library materials many chapters are generic and provide excellent information for any publishing scholar interested in books, articles, other periodicals, and career advancement.

Altmaier, E.M., & Claiborn, C.D. (1987).
Some observations on research and science.
Journal of Counseling and Development,
66(1), 51.

Examines the necessary distinction between science and research, and research and publication.

Appelbaum, J., & Evans. N. (1978).
How to get happily published. New York: Harper & Row.

The book substitutes for the friendly editor who has the time and inclination to reveal the publishing industry. Important facts: 1. Publishers need you, need good material and need fresh talent. 2. Editors make errors. Many books which were rejected went on to make publishing history. 3. There should be an editor somewhere who is looking for what you have to offer; perseverance pays.

Atkinson, D.R., Furlong, M.J., & Wampold, B.E. (1982).
Statistical significance, reviewer evaluations, and the scientific process: Is there a (statistically) significant relationship? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29(2), 189-194.

An empirical study which found that manuscripts which detailed statistical significance were three times more likely to be published than reports of studies which were nonsignificant statistically. A total of 50 APA consulting editors were queried.

Baker, S.S. (1982).
Writing proposals that get book contracts.
The Writer, 95(3), 7-11.

Contract getting suggestions by an author of over 25 books. Provide facts only and eliminate all extraneous material from proposal; the editor is seeking a profit-making book. Steps to follow: 1) title, primary sales points, 2) why book will sell, 3) author background, 4) uniqueness, 5) chapter contents, 6) first chapter and 2 or 3 others, and 7) synopsis for promotion.

Bali, M. (1984).
A writer's guide to buying a word processor. The Writer, 97(4), 5-8.

Detailed information about selecting a microcomputer word processor. Lists requirements for the program, computer, storage, printer and monitor.

Balkin, R. (1977).
A writer's guide to book publishing. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc.

Detailed guidelines as to how to approach a publisher, and how a publisher evaluates a proposal or a manuscript.

Barber, V. (1975).
How to negotiate a publishing contract. Change, 7(3), 61-63.

Carefully examines book contracts. Of particular interest are warranties and indemnities (getting sued), advance against royalties, special discount arrangements, subsidiary rights, reprints, and termination clauses.

Barcombe, W.A. (1974).
On writing textbooks. Community and Junior College Journal, 44(9), 14, 15.

A good college textbook is still the silent partner of most college instructors. Suggests there is no better text for a textbook manuscript than to try out some chapters with students.

Barrs, M. (1983).
The new orthodoxy about writing: Confusing process and pedagogy.
Language Arts, 60(7), 829-840.

Recent shifts in the focus of interest in language education from reading to writing. This new emphasis on writing has had the benefit of being able to draw upon the research on modern reading theory. The authors compare recent North American work on the writing process as well as its differences with the London Institute of Writing Research.

Bayer, A.E., & Dutton, J.E. (1977).
Career age and research-professional activities of academic scientists. Journal of Higher Education, 48(3), 259-282.

Based on a 1972-1973 national study of 5,079 Ph.D. level teaching faculty in 259 colleges and universities. Prime investigation variable was career age. Found that the number of published articles in the last two years was 1-2 articles (28.8%); 5+ articles by 27.4% of faculty. Total number of published articles: 3-10 (31.2%), 11-20 (21.1%), and 21+ total articles by 32% of faculty. Total number of books and

monographs: 1-2 (30.5%), 5+ books by 9.6% of faculty. The average hours spent in research per week was 5-12 hours for 31% of faculty; 13-20 hours, 29.7%. Less than half of the faculty (47.1%) were recently engaged in off-campus paid consulting.

Bean, J.C. (1983).
Computerized word-processing as an aid to revision.
College Composition and Communication, 34, 146-148.

A study which found that beginning writers learn to revise initial drafts with more emphasis on shaping and focusing stages using a word processor. Eliminated concern for rewrites by providing current freshly typed scripts.

Berkenkotter, C. (1983).
Decisions and revisions: The planning strategies and strategies of a publishing writer.
College Composition and Communication, 34(2), 156-169.

Examines and analyzes planning and revision strategies to determine how this new information may further our present knowledge about how skilled writers plan and revise.

Biggs, M. (1985).
Academic publishing and poetry.
Scholarly Publishing, 17(1), 3-23.

Discusses the still small but growing committment to the publication of poetry by institutionally-sponsored journals and univeristy press books.

Boice, R. (1982).
Teaching of writing in psychology: A review of sources.
Teaching of Psychology, 9(3), 143-147.

Examines theoretical psychological views of writing: analytic, nonbehavioral and behavioral. Provides excellent sources, primarily books, on models and methods of good writing.

Boice, R., & Johnson, K. (1984).
Perception and practice of writing for publication by faculty at a doctoral-granting university. Research in Higher Education, 21(1), 33-43.

Four hundred faculty at SUNY-Albany (58% return rate) responded concerning their perception and practice of academic publishing. Most (30%) wrote 2-5 hours per week, 27% 6-10 hours per week. Sporadic writing patterns (56%), while writing in different places (60%) characterized most faculty. Although most writing

times were varied (82%), not A.M. or P.M., 56% sought quiet from distractions. Goal setting (63%), followed by seclusion (34%), and schedule (32%) were the predominent facilitation techniques used. Most found self-experience (86%) as a prime source of help; reviewers 51%. Several drafts (57%) of revisions were noted although only 18% occasionally used word processors; never 72%. Excellent discussion of productivity and faculty development.

Breland, H.M. (1984).
Perceptions of writing skills.
Written Communication, 1(1), 101-119.

Examines the criteria (e.g., content, organization, sentence structure, and mechanics) raters use when making holistic judgments of brief, impromptu essays and whether raters judge such essays in the same way they think they do. Authors compared holistic scores assigned to a random sample (N=806) drawn from over 80,000 essays written for the College Board's English Composition Test, and compared holistic scores assigned to a sample of essays with detailed analyses of the same essays made subsequent to the original scoring. Results indicate that teachers tended to give the most weight to content and organization when evaluating essays, whereas, composition instruction focuses more on mechanics.

Bridgwater, C.A., Bornstein, P.H., & Walkenbach, J. (1981).
Ethical issues and the assignment of publication credit.
American Psychologist, 36(5), 524-525.

A total of 261 academic psychologists (27.5% return rate) from 40 doctoral level programs were queried. Found that contribution (and subsequent publication credit) depended on scholarly importance of work, not time, energy, status, pay or supervision.

Broad, W.J. (1981, March 13).
The publishing game: Getting more for less. Science, 211(4487), 1137-1139.

Examines the Least Publishable Unit (LPU). A fragmentation of research where four short papers are published rather than one long one. Also found the average number of authors per paper was 1.67 in 1960 and 2.58 in 1980.

Brown, C.T. (1984).
Scholarly writing in a department of english.
Scholarly Publishing, 15(3), 205-221.

Excellent discussion defining the nature of scholarly writing in the discipline of English. Its value, and its criteria of evaluation, together with the difficulties faced by those seeking publication are examined.

Budd, J. (1982).
Book reviewing practices of journals in the humanities.
Scholarly Publishing, 13(4), 363-371.

Fifty-eight (89.2%) journal editors responded to a survey concerning book review practices. The journals reviewed an average of about 56 books per year, with a publication delay lag of 7 months. Thirty-two (55.2%) of the editors stated that they do not accept unsolicited book reviews for publication. The importance of book reviews and three journal guidelines for same are detailed.

Buddemeier, R.W. (1981, May 1).
Least publishable unit.
Science, 212(4494), 494.

Notes problems and concerns involved with journals publishing fragmented, or portions of, completed studies: 1) incentive to get publication mileage out of interim and final reports, 2) increases specialization of journals, 3) funding tied to research record, and 4) multiple authorships.

Butler, M.A. (1984).
Publishers, technological change, and copyright:
Maintaining the balance.
Drexel Library Quarterly, 20(3), 28-41.

Examines the tensions and conflict between publishers and librarians/library patrons concerning the rapid changes in technologies in the field of telecommunications and information reproduction/transfer. Publishers see information as a commodity that has a market price and view interlibrary loan practices as "unauthorized" reproduction of copyrighted works which violate copyright laws. The library/user community views information as a social resource that should be widely available to those who need it. The author suggests the formulation of a policy which balances the interests of authors/publishers and librarians/user, while taking care not to impede creativity by unduly restrictive rules or complex legislation.

Butler, S. (1983).
The bridge to real writing: Teaching editing skills. English Quarterly, 16(2), 40-47.

Details the bridge between free expressive writing and writing which is presented to discriminating audiences. The author offers a visual picture of a "bridge," a structural outline which provides a metaphor for showing the relationship between rough drafts of the pre-writing stage and the polished pieces to be presented to an audience.

Burgett, G.L. (1980).
Writing an article for a nursing journal. The Journal of Practical Nursing, 30(11), 43-44, 55.

Excellent examination of how to do an article check; review of the literature. Some topics that are always appropriate for nursing journals: new and better methods, better resource utilization, enhancing self-motivation, family involvement with patients, improving policies and procedures, and professional development.

Campbell, R., & Halliday, T. (1985).
Why so many papers? Scholarly Publishing, 16(4), 313-316.

An informal sampling of British journals indicates a substantial increase in manuscripts for publication in the life Sciences despite cutbacks in funding. Possible reasons for this are: 1. A last effort to gain promotion. 2. Short term grants are more readily attainable. 3. Due to a shortage of long term grants, short term grants yield quicker results. 4. Information storage and retrieval expedite returns.

Cappeto, M.A., & Kauffman, W.E. (1983).
Steps to professional writing. Journal of College Placement, 43(3), 33-36.

Eight steps to professional writing are examined: Why you want to be published, determine your audience, select the medium, read targeted medium, list of topics, make two outlines, select one and write, and read aloud.

Cassidy, M., Porter, R.E., Gould, A.F., & Dierks, J.C. (1977).
The writer's manual. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publishers

A chapter on Scholarly Writing deals with the scholar-author who tries to transplant academic discourse, with a limited audience, to the far larger general audience. Excellent solutions and suggestions offered.

Catroppa, B. (1984).
Writing for publication: Advice from classroom teachers. Language Arts, 61(8), 836-841.

Survey of twenty-two teachers who had published in LA found that the classroom teachers were motivated to share their writing, and because they received support from others - peers, family, co-authors, professors, etc.

Caute, D., & Graham, G. (1983, December 2).
Contacts and contracts. The Times Higher Education Supplement, pp. 14-15.

Clearly examines the intent of book publishing contracts which frequently contain at least 20 clauses. Details what the publisher requires of authors and what the publisher commits to: copyright, manuscript deliverance, illustrations, index, proofing, advance payment, royalties, subsidary rights, and complimentary copies.

Cavanagh, G., & Styles, K. (1983).
Evaluating written work.
English Quarterly, 16(2), 63-68.

An ingredient often missing in the evaluation of student's written work is the teacher's failure to involve students directly in this process. Provides a well designed approach to involve students in the writing and evaluation of their written work.

Ceci, S.J., & Peters, D. (1984).
How blind is blind review?
American Psychologist, 39(12), 1491-1494.

Found that of 146 (73% return) reviewers of 6 psychology journals 35.6% were able to identify authors of blind manuscripts. The well done, intensive study found only 10% of all reviewers able to regularly identify manuscript authors.

Centra, J.A. (1983).
Research productivity and teaching effectiveness. Research in Higher Education, 18(2), 379-389.

Extensive dual research studies that examine the research-teaching relationship. Surveyed 2,973 faculty members from 61 four-year low emphasis on research institutions and 1,623 faculty at 10 institutions with more emphasis on research productivity. Found 1.7 publications during a 5-year period

(49% no publications), and 2.5 publications (44% none) in the second sample. Overall found little support for link between research and teaching performance; consistent, modest relationship in social sciences.

Chase, J.M. (1970).
Normative criteria for scientific publication. American Sociologist, 5(3), 262-265.

A study to determine the criteria used by scientists to evaluate scientific publications. Ranking found: logical rigor, replicability, clarity and conciseness of writing style, orginality, mathematical precision, coverage of significant existing literature, etc. as most important.

Clemente, F. (1973).
Early career determinants of research productivity. American Journal of Sociology, 79(2), 409-419.

A total of 2,205 Ph.D.'s who were members of the American Sociological Association in 1970 were surveyed. Found that early publication activity indicated enhanced subsequent productivity. Gender, rate of educational progress and Ph.D. training department had less impact on academic publications.

Cline, C.G., & Masel-Waters, L. (1983).
At least the editors are trying: Women and sexism in corporate publications. The ABCA Bulletin, 46(3), 26-30.

A pilot study of 29 in-house employee publications in which a content analysis of publication's sexist content was conducted. Authors applied the UPI and IABC guidelines on discrimination in evaluating in-house newsletters. They conclude that overall the degree of editorial awareness of potential bias has been accomplished.

Cole, S., & Cole, J.R. (1967).
Scientific output and recognition: A study in the operation of the reward system in science. American Sociological Review, 32(3), 377-390.

Sampled 120 university physicists drawn from an effective survey of 1,281 (65.5% return). Found quality of publications more important to recognition (awards, appointments, visibility) than quantity of articles.

Crane, D. (1965).
Scientists at major and minor universities: A study of productivity and recognition.
American Sociological Review, 30(5), 699-714.

Productivity, assessed in relation to years since Ph.D., was examined for 150 scientists from three varying level schools. Found having attended a prestigious graduate school had considerable positive effects on productivity and recognition.

Crimando, W. (1981).
An idea-generating paradigm and resources for the practitioner/researcher.
Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 12(3), 107-112.

Elaborates a 4 step idea-generating paradigm for use by human service practitioners who wish to research and publish. The steps of the problem-finding approach involve: performance discrepancy-finding, fact-finding, problem-finding, idea-finding, and research reports. Excellent discourse on field-based research and barriers encountered by practitioners.

Curtis, M.B. (1984).
Masterminding a masterpiece.
Currents (Washington), 10(6), 16-20.

Provides an excellent guide on how to publish a history of your institution.

Curtis, M.E. (1985).
Financial management in publishing journals.
Scholarly Publishing, 17(1), 65-72.

Publishers, usually book companies, that publish journals must consider the specific journal intent, the context of the journal program or series, the organizational or environmental context, and the strategic fit (does it build on strengths?).

Dawson, O. (1983).
Journal writing.
English Quarterly, 16(2), 46-54.

Discusses how one can help improve the quality of their written work, proofreading skills, expression of thoughts in a concrete form, examine one's self-image, and produce records of their personalities at a specific stage of development through personal journal writing.

DelFattore, J. (1986).
Contemporary censorship pressures and their effect on literature textbooks. ADE Bulletin, 83, 35-40.

Examines the controversy concerning censorship of high school literature and the impact this pressure may have on literary works taught, its impact on the preparation of future college students, and the publishing of literature textbooks.

Denham, A. (1982).
Publishing in education journals: Practical advice for contributors. Texas Tech Journal of Education, 9(3), 203-214.

Answers the three most basic questions of prospective journal contributors: How to get started, selecting a journal, and increasing the likelihood of acceptance. Of interest to other than just TTJE potential authors.

Denham, A., & Broom, W. (1981).
The role of the author. Scholarly Publishing, 12(3), 249-258.

A discussion of what professional editors, of both journals and books, require of authors. The obligation to be active and involved in the publishing process is on the author who must understand the editorial and production processes.

Dessauer, J.P. (1981) (2nd ed.).
Book publishing: What it is, what it does. New York: R.R. Bowker Co.

Interesting section on why books fail; faulty editorial judgment, ineffectual marketing efforts, gold-rush syndrome approach (new potential sellers better than good current sellers), etc.

Dillon, J.T. (1981).
The emergence of the colon: A empirical correlate of scholarship. American Psychologist, 36(8), 879-844.

In order to increase the probability of publications in a scholarly journal the authors suggest using a colon and between 15-20 words in the title (72% of cases inspected). In addition the title preferably should be dysrythmic in style.

Dorn, F.J. (1980).
Book reviewing: The counselor's first step in publication. The School Counselor, 27(5), 408-409.

Explores how to obtain texts from book companies for review. Simply write to a book publisher, tell them you wish to do an unsolicited review, and request a specific book. In the review: grab attention, be informative, don't personalize, and provide substance in a short and concise review.

Dorn, F.J. (1985a).
Publishing for professional development. Muncie, Indiana: Accelerated Development Inc.

A how-to book for the novice professional writer. Devotes chapters to a wide range of topics: reasons for writing, generating ideas, time management, marketing, the evaluation process, experimental, review and theoretical articles, and books. Chapters are also devoted to topics rarely examined: query letters, coping with rejection, book reviewing, writing for state journals, "in the field" articles, and freelance opportunities.

Dorn, F.J. (1985b).
Developing your publication potential and copyright confidence. Journal of Counseling and Development, 63(8), 512-514.

A discussion of the developmental process in writing counseling articles. In brief consider the following points: a fresh perspective on the issue, write as you speak, do not send the first draft, examine published manuscript guidelines, expect a request for revision, and identify at least 5 periodicals appropriate for your manuscript.

Dougherty, A.M. (1982).
The publishing counselor. School Counselor, 30(2), 133-137.

Details four helpful areas for counselors wishing to get into print. Philosophical resignation: be realistic, avoid egoism, defer gratification, confidence and desire. Prewriting activities: examine journals, work with a pro, involve others, style, typing, query letters. Writing: revise, devil's advocate, tape draft, references. After submission: persistence and negotiation.

Eash, M. (1983).
Educational research productivity of institutions of higher education. American Educational Research Journal, 20(1), 5-12.

An interesting research project concerning the productivity of institutions of higher education as they relate to Departments of Education. Data sources included participation of schools in the American Educational Research Association, articles published in the 14 leading educational journals (during a 7 year period), and a list from the National Science Foundation of the 50 universities who received the most Federal funds. Results were tabulated and a chart devised which rank ordered the top 25 universities in Education. The top two were Stanford University (Calif.) and the University of California, Los Angeles. Further analysis of the 25 universities placed 19 out of 25 geographically in the North and Northeast part of the country.

Eichorn, D.H., & VandenBos, G.R. (1985).
Dissemination of scientific and professional knowledge. American Psychologist, 40(12), 1309-1316.

An excellent article on how to publish for the American Psychological Association. A history of the organization is presented which includes the many types of journals published by this organization. For the novice writer a step by step review of the editorial process is provided. In addition to reviewing these steps it is stated that a potential author should also review the specific requirements of a journal. An author should consider the following points when submitting a manuscript for publication in an APA journal: 1. At least several copies of the manuscript must be submitted (requirements will differ according to the journal). 2. A cover letter is necessary. 3. Within several weeks the author will receive a letter of acknowledgement. 4. The manuscript will be sent to at least two reviewers. Approximately 90% of all reviews take four months. 5. When the review process is finished the author will receive a letter from the editor which includes reviewer comments and decision for publication. Letters of rejection but advice to resubmit with revisions are far more common than outright acceptance. 6. The rejection rate for APA journals is 75%.

Emmons, C. (1982).
A longitudinal study of the careers of a cohort of assistant professors in psychology. American Psychologist, 37(11), 1228-1238.

A 7-year longitudinal study of 174 women and 171 men who were first employed as assistant professors of psychology in 1971. As concerns academic publishing it was found that female assistant professors had a significantly lower citation rate.

Evans, G.E. (1984).
Implications of "new publishing" for library schools.
Drexel Library Quarterly, 20(3), 87-101.

Publishers are increasingly viewing their product as an "economic commodity" from which they should make a substantial profit. Given this change in attitude and philosophy, librarians, library teachers face new problems and pressures. The article provides some insight into the changing role of library schools as it adjusts to the new economic realities of American publishing.

Ewing, R.E. (1984).
Professional and business books. Chapter 3 in The book publishing annual. New York: R.R. Bowker Co.

Discusses professional and business (or sci-tech for short) books and their production. Also examines the trend toward computer books.

Faigley, L., & Hansen, K. (1985).
Learning to write in the social science.
College Composition and Communication, 36(3), 140-149.

Examined the problems that social sciences present to faculty charged with teaching and writing. Article suggests that teachers must adopt a rhetorical approach to the study of writing in social science disciplines. By succeeding in this endeavor, teachers will help restore rhetoric to the central place in the college curriculum that it once held.

Featheringham, T.R. (1981).
Paperless publishing and potential institutional change.
Scholarly Publishing, 13(1), 19-30.

Existing technologies raise the probability of wall-less "electronic libraries" in the future. Librarians and publishers alike should be prepared for institutional reorganization as paperless publishing increasingly offers new opportunities for dissemination.

Flory, M.B. (1983, January 26).
Semantics and symbioses: How to write an article to impress your peers.
The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 72.

A tongue-in-cheek approach to article writing which suggests "it is central to success to make it as difficult to read as possible as soon as possible".

Forschler, B.K. (1980).
The role of the referee.
Scholarly Publishing, 11(2), 165-169.

Interesting point that journals should be expert-reviewed not peer-reviewed. Comments concerning the journal review process: new ideas, previous literature treated fairly, data supported by method, interpretations, conclusions supported. Notes that anonymity of author difficult due to internal clues and that attempts at anonymity are probably not worth the effort.

Fox, M.F., & Faver, C.A. (1982).
The process of collaboration in scholarly research.
Scholarly Publishing, 13(4), 327-339.

Examines the growth of collaboration due to organizational, institutional and individual factors, via a non-random sample, through semi-structured, depth interviews of twenty social scientists. Choice of collaborative partners due to intellectual and personal factors. Task-relationship-structural variables include: rank, gender, number, sharing, skill, time, resources, control, schedules and contracts.

Frantz, T.T. (1968).
Criteria for publishable manuscripts.
Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47(4), 384-386.

Sixty questionnaires (76% response rate) were returned by members of the editorial boards of six journals. Criteria for evaluation of manuscripts ranked in importance: contribution to knowledge, design of study, objectivity in reporting results, topic selection, writing style and readability, practical implications, statistical analyses, theoretical model, review of literature, etc.

Friedrich, R.J., & Michalak, S.J., Jr. (1983).
Why doesn't research improve teaching?
Journal of Higher Education, 54(2), 145-163.

Seventy-four faculty at Franklin and Marshall College were studied to determine relationship between research and teaching. The complex study found that research accounts for only 2.89% of the variation in teaching effectiveness; a correlation of only .17.

Fulton, O., & Trow, M. (1974).
Research activity in American higher education.
Sociology of Education, 47(1), 29-73.

Reports on the 1969 Carnegie Survey of 60,028 faculty (60% return) in 300 colleges and universities. Found 24% had a very heavy interest in research. A total of 48% reported current publications. Concerning hours in class, 37% reported 6 to 0 hours per week. Full professors reported highest level of research activity.

Fulwiler, T. (1985).
Writing is everybody's business.
National Forum, 65(4), 21-24.

The author, who has worked with approximately one hundred schools to start writing programs, answers the common questions concerning how writing promotes learning, how writers learn to write, assignment of good writing assignments, audience for writing, and evaluation of writing.

Funk, R.W. (1977).
Issues in scholarly publishing.
Scholarly Publishing, 9(1), 3-17.

A critique of an extensive study. The study cited failed to appropriately account for the learned society and the university itself in the scheme of production and dissemination of scholarly knowledge.

Galassi, J.P., Stoltz, R.F., Brooks, L., & Trexler, K.A. (1987).
Improving research training in doctoral counseling programs. Journal of Counseling and Development, 66(1), 40-44.

Survey of all APA-approved and non-APA-approved education and psychology programs in the United States to identify ways to improve research training. Results suggest that first year students be provided with "hands-on" research experience, and a greater emphasis be placed on design rather than statistics training.

Garverick, C.M. (1969).
Are professional journals digging their own graves. The Journal of Creative Behavior, 3(1), 1-4.

Suggestions to broaden the function of professional journals. Determine: Who reads the articles and why? Helpful or not? Meet expectation and needs? Promote: Varied format; emphasis on Discussion/Conclusions/Implications; use questions; suggestions for other, further studies; share ideas; inspire.

Gebhardt, R.C. (1983).
Writing processes, revision, and rhetorical problems: A note on three recent articles. College Composition and Communication, 34(3), 294-296.

Short review of three articles appearing in issues of College Composition and Communication Journal which discussed composition research and theory.

Gehrels, T., Matthews, M.S., & Matthews, M.A.. (1983).
A space age approach to advanced textbooks. Scholarly Publishing, 14(4), 369-375.

The Space Science Series, published by the University of Arizona Press provides definitive, up-to-date coverage of specific fields in the scientific area. These books overcome the limitations of conference proceedings and normal textbooks by combining the stimulus of an open scientific meeting with thorough refereeing and editing.

Geiger, S.R. (1986).
Electronics in publishing and the consequences. Scholarly Publishing, 18(1), 29-31.

Discusses the introduction of electronics into manuscript preparation, typesetting, secondary services, and electronic publications. While expenditures for new electronics have expanded library services, and made publication of research cheaper and easier, this practice has also reduced the amount of money available for the purchase of books and journals. In the long run, electronics may adversely affect the stages of peer review, editing and the future of scientific publication.

Gentile, L.M. (1984).
Writing and publishing in reading: Some suggestions for practicing educators.
Reading World, 24(2), 26-33.

Geared toward the beginning writer who is a practicing educator of reading. The author examines such issues as: 1. Dealing with the fear of criticism and personal competency, 2. Deciding on a topic and approaching a manuscript both from a practical experience as well as through the published works of others professionals. 3. Choosing an appropriate market for your manuscript (i.e., commercial magazines, professional journals, etc.). 4. Consult the guidelines for each potential publisher of your article. These guidelines usually appear in each magazine or journal.

Germano, W.P. (1983).
Helping the local faculty with publication support.
Scholarly Publishing, 15(1), 11-16.

A survey of 110 departments of English and to a lesser degree Romance Languages in state and private institutions of higher learning. The purpose of the study was to determine if presses, projects or authors were receiving publication subsidies to assist in developing books. The results were not untypical as private institutions had more monies to distribute for the purpose. (The general range was between $2,000-$4,000.) However over half of the respondents stated some kind of subsidity program was in operation. The overall consensus is that there is a need both in the private and public sectors to promote special programs for publication subsidies. Help is needed to eliminate barriers that inhibit specifically needed assistance to scholars for writing books.

Gill, J.H.
Publish and Perish.
In: Kujoth, J.S. (1971). Book publishing: Inside views.
Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

An amusing look at "how to fail at publishing while trying your hardest". Successful failure points: poorly educated helps, not learning to write at school, submit reworked school papers, take a stance against periodical policy, and maintaining a balance between the Rational and the Absurd. Elements of editorial postal gamesmanship: Speed-it takes years to see the final work, Thoroughness-exhaustively solicitous, Reward-"college and university administrators do not read learned journals at all".

Gilman, P. (1978).
Dear contributor: We regret to inform you. Journal of Teacher Education, 29(4), 67-68.

Examines various types of rejection letters received.

Gladding, S.T. (1984).
Multiple authorship in the Personnel and Guidance Journal: A 12-year study.
Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62(10), 628-630.

With an acceptance rate of about 25% the journal examined authorship for a 12-year period (1971-1982). Found a trend that indicated fewer single-authored articles were being published. Possible reasons discussed: pressure to publish-tenure, more collaboration, more special issues, emphasis on networking and mentoring.

Gladding, S.T., Wilcoxon, S.A. (1987).
Programmatic writing: A "what to" option for professional publication. Journal of Counseling and Development, 66(1), 52.

Examines programmatic writing (i.e. writing which focuses publication efforts on an exclusive topic) as a method of increasing expertise and success for counselors desiring professional development and recognition through publication.

Glenn, N.D. (1976).
The journal article review process: Some proposals for change.
The American Sociologist, 11(3), 179-185.

Journals disseminate findings, provide a gatekeeper function, and confer recognition and rewards. To continue these functions with too many manuscripts being submitted and limited human resources changes in the manuscript review process should be made: 1) editors should reject highly improbable manuscripts immediately, 2) editorial decisions and selecting referees should be spread over 3-4 professionals, 3) reviewers should provide written feedback, and 4) all papers sent to at least 3 reviewers.

Glueck, W.F., & Jauch, L.R. (1975).
Sources of research ideas among productive scholars: Implications for administrators. Journal of Higher Education, 46, 103-114.

A total of 160 productive hard-science faculty at the University of Missouri-Columbia were queried as to sources of research ideas. Found self-reliance and development based on previous work main sources.

Graburn, N.H.H. (1981).
University press books in the classroom.
Scholarly Publishing, 13(1), 70-78.

Considers the problem of academic books being published for expected large volume sales rather than quality and the dissemination of knowledge. Increased publication of previously copyrighted materials and the taxation ruling concerning write-offs of press inventories compounds the problem of publishing books which may become classics.

Graham, G. (1982).
Managing change in professional publishing.
Scholarly Publishing, 14(1), 3-8.

Examines the change toward an information society. Change should be managed so as to result in better products, maintain quality, assure creativity, and use new technology appropriately.

Grannis, C.B. (1984).
Chapter 2 in The book publishing annual. New York: R.R. Bowker Co.

Relates that more university presses than ever before (80+) account for 10 to 11 percent of the title output in the U.S.

Greaser, C.U. (1979).
Improving the effectiveness of research writing.
Scholarly Publishing, 11(1), 61-71.

Details an experimental effective writing workshop at the Rand Corporation. The corporation has a 500 member research staff and has found that university training generally neglects professional writing.

Hanna, S.S. (1983).
Looking for a publisher.
Publishers Weekly, 224(20), 17-19.

The author examines the eight different categories/formats of rejections he received trying to obtain a book contract. He is still looking for a publisher.

Harley, J.K. (1983).
The smell of the lamp: Bad writing in the behavioral sciences. Canadian Journal of Education, 8(3), 245-262.

Discusses the causes of bad writing in the behavioral sciences while offering potential remedies for this problem.

Harry, J., & Goldner, N.S. (1972).
The null relationship between teaching and research. Sociology of Education, 45(1), 47-60.

Very sophisticated statistical analysis of the relationship between student ratings of instructors and faculty academic publishing found no direct interaction. Data suggest that faculty researchers tend to teach more difficult courses and require more student study-time. Student evaluate faculty on style and enthusiasm rather than difficulty or content. Overall, they suggest that research activity and academic publishing are unrelated, or moderately and positively related, to teaching effectiveness.

Hashimoto, I. (1983).
Toward a taxonomy of scholarly publication. College English, 45(5), 500-505.

Proposes the adoption of a new system of classification of scholarly publications, built around classifications used to describe World War II naval vessels. Author suggests that the proposed system should improve the quality of scholarly writing.

Hawes, G.R. (1967).
To advance knowledge: A handbook on American university press publishing. New York: American University press.

Provides an excellent discourse on how individual university presses evolved. A table outlining starting dates is provided.

Henisch, H.K., & Roy, R. (1977).
Refereeing rectitude [Letter to the Editor].
Physics Today, 30(5), 104-105.

Examines the practice of some journals of allowing authors to select reviewers from a predetermined list of associate editors.

Henson, K.T. (1984).
Writing for professional publication: Ways to increase your success.
Phi Delta Kappan, 65(8), 635-637.

Queried 41 education journals about a number of characteristics which are well illustrated in a table: acceptance rate, length, refereed, percentage research, articles per year, issues per year, university personnel contributors, query letters, day to answer, receipt time, weeks to decision, and effect of photos. Interesting data include: four-fifths of manuscripts rejected, three-fourths of contributors university personnel, two-thirds of editors do not want query letters, most frequent mistake is failing to acquaint with journal, readers, and submission guidelines.

Hicks, R.A. (1974).
The relationship between publishing and teaching effectiveness.
California Journal of Educational Research, 25(3), 140-146.

The majority of studies have failed to find a significant relationship between research productivity and student ratings. This study examined 147 San Jose State University professors who had published and 312 who had not. The data revealed a positive relationship but further concludes this may be only trivial in nature as it is a poor criterion for the establishment of a meaningful relationship.

Hogan, J.C., & Cohen, S. (1965).
Publishing your book. (Chapt 4, Sect. 1)
An author's guide to scholarly publishing and the law.
Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall

Surveys the steps in finding a publisher for a book: 1. Consult The Literary Market Place, a directory of the book publishing trade. 2. Survey other books in the field to find a range of publishers. 3. Scholarly books do not need a literary agent. 4. Write to the main office of the publisher. 5. Submit an appropriate prospectus. 6. Can be sent to a dozen or so publishers at the same time. 7. Some publishers will not examine dissertations until they have been revised.

Hoge, J.O., & West, J.L.W., III. (1979).
Academic book reviewing: Some problems and suggestions.
Scholarly Publishing, 11(1), 35-41.

The low status given to published book reviews caused by: lack of editorial attention, lax standards, mediocre reviews, reviewers not carefully selected, little scrutiny, time lags, and not taken seriously by university promotion/tenure. Offers suggestions to enhance quality and respectability of book reviews.

Holmes, M. (1982).
Formula for success.
The Writer, 95(11), 9-11, 23.

A best selling author offers several suggestions to new writers: 1. Talent for writing is a gift. 2. Talent can only be developed through study and practice. 3. Failure is when you stop trying. Expect rejection of your work. Expect to rewrite and rewrite your work. And expect to succeed. 4. Write everyday.

Hood, A.B. (1984).
Knowledge dissemination and the role of professional journals.
Journal of College Student Personnel, 25(1), 17-18.

Notes that the role and function of a journal in an applied field differs from that of a scientific journal. The applied journal, such as JCSP, exists primarily for the readers (in this case mostly practitioners) although nearly half of the article authors are university professors. An applied journal relates basic knowledge to the field and reports applied field experimental data.

Hoover, K.H. (1980).
Responsibilities for professional growth: Writing techniques. (Chap. 17).
College teaching today. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Generally examines the approaches and techniques of professional writing. An excellent brief section on the value of such writing: affords visible leadership role, keeps up with latest developments, increase teaching competence, and rewards. Limitations and problems equally examined: some unable to become competent writers, too much a part of professional evaluations, time and effort interfere with other activities, little consideration for quality and excessive publication time lags.

Horowitz, I.L., & Curtis, M.E. (1982).
The impact of technology on scholarly publishing.
Scholarly Publishing, 13(3), 211-228.

Emphasizes the impact of new technologies, not simply in the publishing business as it exists, but with respect to its consequences for the social structure of the publishing business.

Howe, M.R. (1982).
Help for the scholar-author.
Scholarly Publishing, 13(2), 157-166.

Carefully reviews the various roles of the freelance editor. As more publishers are using freelance editors the scholar-publisher should understand both the publisher-editor and freelance-editor functions.

Hoyt, D.P. (1974).
Interrelationships among instructional effectiveness, publication record, and monetary reward.
Research in Higher Education, 2(1), 81-88.

A correlation study of 222 Kent State University faculty with two or more years found that teacher effectiveness was not related to academic publications. Modest relationship existed with fiscal rewards.

Hoyt, D.P., & Spangler, R.K. (1976).
Faculty research involvement and instructional outcomes.
Research in Higher Education, 4(2), 113-122.

Ratings of faculty by department heads on research involvement and by students on teaching outcomes had mixed results. For research involvement in natural-mathematical sciences student ratings were positively related. They were negatively related for social-behavioral faculty. The n=183 study found that researchers seemed to set higher academic standards in classes.

Johns, J.L. (1983).
Selecting manuscripts for publication.
Reading World, 23(1), 3-6.

A detailed process of manuscript selection is provided for the refereed journal Reading World. In brief the steps are: 1. Upon receipt of a manuscript the authors name is removed to assure a blind review. 2. The manuscript is sent to three appropriate editorial advisors. 3. Two out of three reviewers must agree in order for a manuscript to be recommended for acceptance. 4. A fourth advisor may be requested when the reviews are mixed. 5. Manuscripts that are viewed as having the potential for publication but need revision are sent to the author with recommendations. 6. Resubmitted manuscripts are sent back to the original reviewers. 7. Exact guidelines are provided and should be followed.

Johnson, E. (1986).
Writing style. Performance and Instruction Journal, 25(5), 2.

Six point approach addressing the subject of writing style. The author elaborates on the importance of the sixth point--the writer's tone.

Johnson, N. (1982).
Publishing: How to get started.
Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60(5), 321-322.

Tips on how to overcome fear of failure and lack of confidence finally leading to: overcoming fear of statistics, picking the right outlet, developing and writing an article, submission guidelines, manuscript revision, and patience.

Johnson, R. (1985).
How to get started.
The Writer, 98(7), 23-24.

Tips on how to overcome a 'mini-freeze': 1) just start putting words down--in any order, 2) on the day before stop in the middle of a paragraph that will be easy to finish, 3) don't get out of bed until you've come up with something to advance the work, 4) set daily quotas...a looming deadline, 5) try to get a second wind at night... often wake up with the solution, and 6) discipline yourself.

Kaplan, L. (1977).
Survival talk for educators: Tenure and promotion.
Journal of Teacher Education, 28(5), 37-38.

Responses by new faculty as to what they think it will take to achieve academic success.

Katz, S.B., Kapes, J.T. & Zirkel, P.A. (1980).
Resources for writing for publication in education.
New York: Teachers College Press.

A how-to book which specializes in academic publishing in the field of education. An excellent introductory chapter examining the importance of academic publications: monetary rewards, contributions and usefulness, and activities which promote publishing. Chapters on conference and convention papers, journals, book and monographs, indices, manuals and guides, and copyright information.

Katzen, M. (1986).
Electronic publishing in the humanities. Scholarly Publishing, 18(1), 5-16.

Examines concerns generated by electronic publishing because its broad applications relative to methods of transferring information between authors and their audiences. Article suggests that on-line communication may have the greatest impact, involving electronic bulletin boards and a sharing of responsibilities with the traditional print journal.

Kelly, K. (1985).
Professional writing in the humanities course. College Composition and Communication, 36(2), 234-237.

Suggests that the "advanced expository writing course" may solve the dilemma facing English departments when faced with demands for courses in business or technical writing, which often results in excluding the more traditional humanities subject from many students' programs.

Kingsley, M.S. (1976).
Evaluating faculty publications. Liberal Education, 62, 392-400.

Suggests grading faculty publications on a A through F scale, and periodically calculate a grade point average - just like a college course.

Kiniry, M., & Strenski, E. (1985).
Sequencing expository writing: A recursive approach. College Composition & Communication, 36(2), 191-202.

Essay suggests a system for arranging assignments in a composition course that aims to prepare students for academic writing. Also focuses on exposition and its conceptual demands--the writing skills needed most for students in order to survive or excel in college.

Kirkman, R.E., & Darrell, B. (1980).
Writing well: Ten commandments for educators. Peabody Journal of Education, 58, 61-68.

Finds that current writing in Education is substandard and at best bland and jargon infested. An interesting point reveals that the Peabody Journal of Education receives 1,000+ manuscripts annually and only prints about 60. Ten pointers or "commandments" as they are referred to by the author are presented in an attempt to help the writer upgrade the content of a manuscript.

Klemp, P.J. (1981).
Reviewing academic books: Some ideas for beginners. Scholarly Publishing, 12(2), 135-139.

Briefly examines what the author sees as the steps in book reviewing. Comments concerning assessing the audience that will read the review, and who the book author saw as an appropriate book user.

Kuh, G.D., Bean, J.P., Bradley, R.K., & Coomes, M.D. (1986).
Contributions of student affairs journals to the literature on college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27(4), 292-304.

Comprehensive study on the characteristics of articles presenting research on college students published between 1969 and 1983 in four student affairs periodicals and in seven other educational periodicals with high circulation were compared. Data about the articles was gathered using the College Student Research Case Study Questionnaire.

Kuh, G.D., & Bursky, M. (1980).
Knowledge dissemination by publication in student affairs: Who publishes what where? Journal of College Student Personnel, 21(5), 387-393.

A study of 1,268 articles between 1970-1978 in four student affairs journals were analyzed to determine the types of articles published in each Journal and the institutional rates of productivity. Found approximately 40% of the contributors to the four major student affairs journals are affiliated with only 25 institutions.

Ladd, E.C., Jr., & Lipset, S.M. (1976, March 29).
What do professors like best about their jobs? Surprise: It isn't research. The Chronical of Higher Education, p. 10.

A study which found that 74% of faculty felt teaching effectiveness, not publications, should be the primary criterion for promotion. Also found faculty who prefer research to teaching receive much higher salaries.

Lindsey, D. (1978).
The scientific publication system in social science. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

This book, which is further titled: A study of the operation of leading professional journals in psychology, sociology, and social work, provides an excellent examination through the citation of research studies, and one particular study conducted by the author, of the overall system of journal publication in three social science fields. Rather than an examination of scientific publications it is a scientific examination of the system itself. How it is that journal editors and referees make decisions and why "the value of an author's finding to the field" is the paramount criterion for publication actually comes about. The text examines the filtration system and overseeing function that journals serve as well as numerous shortcomings that are inherent in the system. Excellent for those interested in the internal mechanisms of journals rather than for those who are seeking to publish specifically.

Linsky, A.S., & Straus, M.A. (1975).
Student evaluations, research productivity, and eminence of college faculty.
Journal of Higher Education, 46(1), 89-102.

A comprehensive study of approximately 5,000 faculty on 16 campuses across the country. Found that publications and citations were not correlated with teaching. Class size, course level and faculty position are related to teacher effectiveness.

Lumsden, D.B., & Fuller, F. (1984).
Publishing opportunities for community college educators.
Community College Review, 12(1), 48-60.

Identifies and describes 15 journals in the United States that cater specifically to the publishing needs and interests of community college faculty and administrators. These 15 periodicals describe what community college authors need to know before submitting manuscript materials.

Lyle, S.P. (1984).
Author's guides to scholarly periodicals.
Scholarly Publishing, 15(3), 273-279.

List comprehensive author guides for journal writing in the following disciplines: 1. Behavioral and social sciences, 2. Business, 3. Education, 4. Humanities, and 5. Multi-subject. The 17 guides provide considerable information about journals in the particular area of interest.

MacManus, Y. (1985).
Unruly writing.
Training and Development Journal, 39(8), 39-43.

An interesting article outlining specific points for educational material that will improve writing style (e.g., a conversational approach is preferable, use descriptive adjective and action verbs, breakup the pace by using past and future tenses, keep the text lively and keep human interest high). Book writings was briefly explored. Three points were of particular note: 1. Before starting a book, review New York Times, Small Press, etc. to see what is being currently published and who is publishing them. 2. If your idea appears marketable put an outline and three chapters together for a publishing company. 3. If you choose to publish your own book consult reference sources such as: Jeffery Lant, The unabashed self-promoter's guide, JLA Publications or Dan Poynter, The self-publishing manual: How to write, print and sell your own book, Para Publishing.

MacPhail, B.D. (1980).
Book reviews and the scholarly publisher.
Scholarly Publishing, 12(1), 55-63.

Outlines advantages of book reviews. For publishers - promotion, evaluation and very cost effective. For readers - information and ideas for new directions. Publishers feel a 1-2% response on a promotional mailing (flyers) is good. For 2,000 copy edition, 100 complimentary books may be sent out.

Madigan, C. (1985).
Improving writing assignments with communication theory.
College Composition and Communication, 36(2), 183-190.

Examines a theory based on an adaptation of Jakobson's model which helps teachers construct complete, appropriate assignments and identify instructional needs.

Mann, P.H. (1981).
Publishing the scholarly author.
Scholarly Publishing, 12(2), 99-108.

Addresses the symbiotic relationship between author and publisher through an analysis of 72 academic books published by 5 British companies. Recommendations include: 1. New scholars should meet publishers early. 2. Authors should understand publishing economics. 3. Authors should understand that time is money and agreements (due dates) should be honored. 4. Publishers have different subject interests. 5. Make contracts simple.

Mansbridge, R. (1980).
'My publishers are terribble...'
Scholarly Publishing, 11(2), 133-140.

Helps authors to be aware of problems that others have had with their publishers. Examples: Too much editing, poor communication, unfulfilled promises of advertising, serious errors in manufacturing (binding, jackets), violated contracts, etc.

Markland, M.F. (1983).
Taking criticism - and using it.
Scholarly Publishing, 14(2), 139-148.

"Don't ask for criticism unless you really want it" and "Don't try to prove your critic wrong" violate basic principles of receiving criticism. Reviews eight frequent comments authors receive: not appropriate, have not done homework, too introductory, nothing new to say, no support, not clear, lacks detail and badly written. Examines what these reviewer comments really mean and suggests action.

McCarty, W. (1984).
Wheels within wheels: A topology for scholarly publishing.
Scholarly Publishing, 15(3), 229-235.

A creative approach in reducing the cost of publishing is examined. In short the approach consists of computerized text editing and typesetting. This consists of small clusters of computers (systems) linked to a mainframe within the university. The entire process could be electively used by individuals to enter a greater networking system that could electronically link North America.

McCleary, W.J. (1985).
A case approach for teaching academic writing. College Composition and Communication, 36(2), 203-212.

Elaborates an "academic case approach" designed to teach students academic writing. Author's writing technique was borrowed from legal writing.

McConnell, J.V. (1978).
Confessions of a textbook writer.
American Psychologist, 33(2), 159-169.

Examines the problem of introductory texts being encyclopedic but also dramatic so that students remember the material. Students prefer a text which is simple, well-organized, coherent, comprehensive yet interesting. Unfortunately instructors find such books too simple.

McKeon, J.J. (1983).
Should you try book publishing?
Association Management, 35(7), 77-83.

Examines why and how a professional association (not an individual) can publish a book.

McMillen, L. (1986, February 5).
A doctoral dissertation is not yet a book, young tenure-seeking scholars are told.
Chronicle of Higher Education, 31(21), 23-24.

Suggested tips for publishing a dissertation: 1) make material interesting, 2) eliminate extensive documentation, 3) write for a specific reader, 4) do research on publishers before submitting.

McQuaid, E.P. (1982, June 2).
Authors of scholarly books urged to set publishing guidelines.
The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 23.

Details the formation of a national writers union. The union would establish guidelines concerning scholarly manuscript publication and lobby to increase the financing of grants and royalties.

Meredith, J.C. (1985).
Scholarly reprint publishing in the United States: A new look. College and Research Libraries, 46(2), 133-139.

Examines the results of a 1969 survey by Carol A. Nemeyer of scholarly reprint activity in the United States. Authors conclude that a new comprehensive survey limited to domestic practice is presently not needed due to the internationalization of production and marketing.

Meyer, C. (1982).
The writer's survival manual: The complete guide to getting your book published right.
New York: Bantam.

An extensive review of book publishing. From how to find a publisher, to working with a literary agent; this book examines in depth such topics as negotiating contracts, marketing, sales, subsidiary rights and mass-market paper back production. Focuses on trade-books rather than academic publishing.

Meyer, S., & Phillabaum, L.E. (1980).
What is a university press?
Scholarly Publishing, 11(3), 213-219.

A university press serves basically two functions: 1. Advancement of knowledge between scholar and scholar, and 2. Bridging the gap between the academic community and society at large. The university press distinctly faces the responsibility of serving not only university faculty but functions as part of the book publishing industry, and hence non-academic publishing. The tightening of financial budgets require a re-examination of the accepted philosophy that a university press may operate on a deficit.

Michalak, S.J., Jr. & Friedrich, R.J. (1981).
Research productivity and teaching effectiveness at a small liberal arts college.
Journal of Higher Education, 52(6), 578-597.

Examines the assumption that faculty who engage in research are better instructors than those who do not publish. Having found fewer than a dozen systematic studies on the relationship, and only one which showed a statistically significant relationship, a study conducted at Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Penn., which has about 125 faculty. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (+.33) found that for this small liberal arts college research and teaching have something positive to do with each other, but not too much.

Miller, W.C. (1974).
Writing for journal publication. Educational Leadership, 32, 51-53.

Suggestions for writing: 1) analyze reasons for writing, 2) be prepared to work, 3) plan your approach, 4) give attention to style, technique and mechanics, 5) get reactions to your writing, and 6) select the type of article with care.

Mills, R.M. (1983).
Tradition and innovation in scholarly publishing.
Scholarly Publishing, 15(1), 41-50.

The undue time, length and cost of the publishing process is examined. The citation system and ways to make easier and earlier the recognization of innovative approaches are delineated. Traditional, current methods do not meet the new needs of academic publishing.

Mirman, R. (1975).
For open refereeing.
American Journal of Physics, 43(9), 837.

Makes the argument that often reviewers need incentives to do critiques properly, and that criticism appears openly for published papers why not reviews?

Morton, H.C. (1980).
Research on the printed word: A review.
Scholarly Publishing, 11(4), 361-370.

A review of a four volume examination of scholarly publishing. The four volumes, which examine book publishing, journals, libraries and a summary volume dealing with books, journals and bibliographic services, were assisted by the National Science Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities, among others. The book (study) series features an economic orientation to academic publishing. In the 1200+ pages considerable data is provided, e.g. commercial vs. university press - commercial press runs twice as long, direct cost lower, mark-up higher, and discount lower.

Mullins, C.J. (1982).
Why a word processor?
The Writer, 95(8), 19-22.

Provides the basic facts about types of word processors (i.e. dedicated systems and personal computer programs). The author encourages such an investment because: 1. Quality of typing and setting is professional. 2. Output of work is about four times greater. 3. Processors have memory banks to retrieve names, addresses, whole manuscripts, aids revision, spelling errors, etc. 4. Word processors take from a day to week to master.

Nelson, R.P. (1978).
Book design. (Chap. 12).
Publication design. (2nd Ed.). Wm. C. Brown Co.

An excellent chapter which covers "the look of the book" as well as an overall understanding of book publishing. Several hundred publishers, some doing 600-700 titles, put out about 40,000 different books per year. Textbooks, tradebooks and reference/children's books are the three major categories of publishing. Each has its own structure concerning editing, producing, pricing and design. The chapter clearly and briefly details: books paper, page sizes, margins, typography, art, binding, cover and jacket.

Oakeshott, P. (1985).
The "BLEND" experiment in electronic publishing.
Scholarly Publishing, 17(1), 25-36.

Accounts a four year British-based study of the implementation of an electronic networked communication system. Found considerable benefits from the process: pool and exchange ideas, see papers before publication, and feedback. Disadvantages concerned: time to write, software/hardware problems, and need to know more about human aspects of researching. A survey revealed that although habits varied many wrote and read at specific times, often outside office hours. This accounts for 65% of browsing, 85% of reading entire works, and 63% of actual writing.

Oberrecht, K. (1985).
Outlines that sell books.
The Writer, 98(5), 19-22.

Reveals that although most book contracts are obtained through an outline and a sample of chapters, outlines alone can do the job. Provides an excellent perspective to developing effective (contract-obtaining) book outlines: title (alternative/working), description, style, manuscript length, divisions, completion time, marketing (sales potential/competing volumes), authors qualifications.

O'Brien, C.R., & Johnson, J. (1980).
Promoting professional development skills. Journal of College Student Personnel, 21(6), 568-569.

Details a workshop approach at Western Illinois University for convention presentations and academic publishing. Publishing segment: determine content, pick appropriate journal, prepare manuscript, and use reviewers' comments.

Ostrowski, P.M., & Bartel, S. (1985).
Assisting practitioners to publish through the use of support groups.
Journal of Counseling and Development, 63(8), 510-511.

Focused its attention toward practitioners in the field who wish to publish. The tool used to facilitate the focus was the notion of support groups. Guidelines to general operation were: 1. Formulating goals of the group (writing to promote career development, sharing ideas, continuing education). 2. Have a regular meeting date. 3. Provide motivation to group members. 4. Give immediate feedback to group members.

Parkhurst, B. (1979).
Textbooks: Dull is null, spice is nice.
Change, 11(4), 18-22.

Debate over readability versus standards. Programmed learning texts, scholarship, a lively style and frequent revisions all play a part in the book publishing/selling and education industry.

Parrish, P.S. (1983).
Seven ways to lengthen a publication list without doing anything very original.
Chronicle of Higher Education, 26(12), 64.

A not so tongue-in-cheek article based on the assumptions that: a long publication list of any sort is better than a short one, nobody in the department actually reads the material, and abstruse titles are impressive. The seven "lots of publications" techniques include: 1. new techniques, 2. publish the work in dribs and drabs, 3. a series of related papers, 4. make something new, 5. published titles that are not actually publications-proceedings, abstracts, etc., 6. slightly different versions to different journals, and 7. report measurements.

Pascal, N.B. (1982).
How much editing is enough?
Scholarly Publishing, 13(3), 263-268.

Financial realities (time-cost) often limits considered, dedicated editing. Camera-ready copy, word processing, etc. are ways to pass some cost back to the author allowing editing to concentrate on traditional matters (style, values, approach).

Pascal, N.B. (1985).
Freedom, responsibility, and the agile editor.
Scholarly Publishing, 16(3), 255-262.

Discussed the overt or implied pressure, from within or without, that university presses are subject to concerning the publication of controversial issues and materials.

Pascal, N.B. (1985).
The changing world of scholarly publishing. Drexel Library Quarterly, 20(3), 63-74.

Examines the new directions in university press publishing, and some of the reasons for these changes. Traditionally, university presses published results of the scholarly community. Recently, university presses have widened the range of their publishing programs to works of fiction, art books, and catalogues of museum collections or exhibitions.

Payne, J., & Wagner, J. (1984).
Librarians, publications, and tenure. College and Research Libraries, 45(2), 133-139.

A study which surveyed 59 directors of university libraries covering 35 states and the District of Columbia to determine the extent to which publishing is a factor for them in obtaining tenure and/or promotion. Of the 43 libraries that responded only three said publishing was a requirement for tenure, and for two of the three, publishing is a requirement for promotion as well. All three responded that their criteria for tenure are the same as those for teaching faculty.

Penaskovic, R. (1985).
Facing up to the publication gun.
Scholarly Publishing, 16(2), 136-140.

Seven publishing survival skills: 1. Lack of motivation-no remuneration for article writing. 2. Ideas are everywhere-be attuned to them. 3. Articles should have the point clearly stated at the beginning. 4. Don't read too much-start writing. 5. Fresh angle-write what no one else has. 6. Without time-write in snatches. 7. Returns (rejections) mean free criticism.

Perry, S. (1983, June 22).
Dealing with publishers: Suggestions from a study of academic authors.
The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 19, 22.

Author information about the fundamentals of book publishing: 1. After contracts are signed, and the manuscript delivered, the author should realize that the publisher is usually not obligated to bring out the book. 2. An author is free to submit manuscripts to more than one publisher. 3. Once a manuscript has been accepted request a contract clause that states the publisher will use its "best efforts" in publishing. 4. Ask the publisher to provide detailed information on royalties. 5. To assure that the book is sold at a reasonable price the author

should get an agreement from the publisher. 6. Make sure there is a formula whereby the author can share in proceeds from foreign sales. 7. Ask for the opportunity to correct errors before your book is reprinted. 8. Royalty payments as a rule range from 10% to 15%.

Phillips, D. (1982).
Catalyst for student composition and language study.
English Quarterly, 15(3), 18-20.

Discusses the formulaic writing approach employed by teachers to stimulate student writing. Analysis of sentence structure, the study of parts of speech, as well as the levels of language and case were examined.

Philipson, M. (1974).
The quality of scholarly writing and scholarly publishing today.
Scholarly Publishing, 6(1), 9-18.

Examines how the different objectives of the university professor, university administrator, and the publisher can influence the significance and quality of publishing scholarly works.

Pipes, R.B., & Westefeld, J.S. (1987).
Some thoughts about research training.
Journal of Counseling and Development, 66(1), 50.

Suggests that good research is fostered by curiosity. Offers suggestions how to get students involved in research other than the thesis, dissertation, and course work requirements.

Piternick, A.B. (1982).
Requirements for the scholarly journal in transition.
Scholarly Publishing, 14(1), 49-59.

As publication and dissemination become increasingly mechanized in the scholarly communication process, attention must be paid to appropriate formats, standardized bibliographic data, requirements of separates, and subject retrieval of journal articles.

Powell, W.W. (1985).
Getting into print.
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

A sociological study of how it is that editors in academic publishing decide which book to publish. The research, supported by a NIMH grant and a Yale Program on Non-Profit Organizations grant noted that "publishing is the primary measure of academic achievement". Basically examines three questions: 1) How is the matching decision - editors looking to make up their rosters and authors looking for a publisher - really made? 2) What is the role and function of scholarly book editors and 3) In what context/arena do scholarly houses function - social, economic, publishing industry, competition, marketing, etc.

Professional Notes and Comment. (1974).
Facts of scholarly publishing: Book-length works on literature.
PMLA, 89(2), 360-376.

Reviews statistical trends in the publication of book-length works on literature--criticism, literary history, biographies of writers, critical anthologies, editions--from the 1960's to the present. In addition, the article estimates the prospects for the publication of such books in the coming five years.

Rae, C. (1986).
Before the outline--The writing wheel.
College Teaching, 34(3), 99-102.

Because many writers using outlines to organize thoughts before writing find them too abstract, the author offers a new technique--the writing wheel. This technique enables you to visualize what you want to say prior to placing thoughts on paper and by leading you to the outline as a secondary rather than as a primary step.

Rainey, B.G. (1973).
Guidelines: Writing for journals. Clearing House, 48, 44-49.

Requisites for publishing success: a questioning mind, knowledge of discipline, insatiable reading habits, language facility, a story to tell, timelines, research mindedness, a reflective mind, self-discipline and self-criticism, dissatisfaction, knowledge of needs, creative loneliness and regularity of writing, desire to improve practices, flair for writing, involvement, courage to fail coupled with a sense of humor, research input and graduate work.

Rauch, S.J. (1982).
How to get published.
Reading World, 21(3), 188-192.

Advice from 14 editors of publishing companies to potential authors of reading texts and workbooks.

Reeds, K. (1983).
Publishing scholarly books in the sixteenth century.
Scholarly Publishing, 14(3), 259-274.

Emphasizes the similarities between sixteenth-century scholarly publishing practices and those of a university press today. The author also states that today's scholarly publishers would do even better by emulating the innovative spirit of the Renaissance forerunners by adapting new ways of assembling texts, constructing images and organizing.

Reitt, B.B. (1980).
The editor turns teacher.
Scholarly Publishing, 11(3), 256-266.

Examines the syllabus of a 10-week graduate level course at Emory University which is focused toward academic publishing.

Reitt, B.B. (1984).
An academic author's checklist
Scholarly Publishing, 16(1), 65-72.

A very detailed checklist to determine the completeness of an article. Major headings of the excellent list include: 1. Is it complete?, 2. Is it authoritative?, 3. Is it expert?, 4. Is it singular?, 5. Is it finished?, Each of the five headings involves numerous well formulated questions writers should answer before manuscript submission.

Riggar, T.F., & Maki, D.R. (1980).
Stages in professional writing: A guide to authors.
Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 13(1), 9-12.

A description of aspects of technical requirements of professional writing and comments concerning the approaches to developing manuscripts in general. Manuscript development, stylistic format, and the editorial process are presented with considerable clarity. The manuscript development section suggests approaches and factors determining what a budding author should examine. The format section summarizes the

standard APA format information and the editorial process section provides an excellent figure which outlines the entire review paradigm used by most journals.

Riggar, T.F. & Maki, D.R. (1981).
An empirical examination of professional publication. Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 14(1), 32-35.

Found that 90.4% of members were non-university based personnel. Fifty-two percent of university based members indicated they had submitted a manuscript to any professional journal, while only 14.5% of non-university personnel had ever submitted to any. "No time" was the reason cited by 25% of non-university people and by 46% of university based for not submitting articles for publication. "Don't really care about writing articles in professional journals" was 23% for non-university and 8% of university-based personnel.

Riggs, R.C. (1978).
Sources of journal articles in select APGA journals according to academic rank of authors. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 57(1), 40-41.

Determined academic rank of authors of 492 articles in four American Association of Counseling and Development journals from 1975-1977. Overall 41.2% of authors indicated no rank, 52.8% reported Assistant Professor (19%), Associate (17.11%), or Professor (16.72%) rank.

Robinson, P.W. & Higbee, K.L. (1978).
Publishing a textbook: Advice from authors and publishers. Teaching of Psychology, 5(4), 175-181.

A study which queried 108 authors and 16 editors about their publishing experience. Found 52% of authors had submitted to only one publisher; 20% to 2-3 publishers. Sixty-two percent of authors offered one contract; 27% offered 2-3 contracts for the book. Authors reported 1 year (20%) to write book; 32% 2 years, 22% 3 years. Only 24% of books published (proofreading to 'in stock') in 6 months or less; 31% 6-9 months, 33% 9-12 months. Advice to new authors: compare publishers, talk with experienced authors, and it takes more time than planned. Publishers reported 500-1000 manuscripts per year (10%); 80% (200-300), 10% (100-200). Of nearly 3,000 reported manuscripts (154) 5% received contracts. Editors characterized good author attributes as professional activity and academic background (43%), writing experience (23%). Most common author problems, 15% unwilling to accept reviewer comments.

Rodman, H. (1970).
The moral responsibility of journal editors and referees.
American Sociologist, 5(4), 351-357.

Queries the often inordinate time it takes to review manuscripts and the size of a journal's backlog (publication delay). Recommends a "contract" between journal editor and reviewers limiting number of reviews and return time limits. Further suggests informing prospective authors why a manuscript was rejected.

Rodman, H. (1978).
Some practical advice for journal contributors.
Scholarly Publishing, 9(3), 233-241.

Answers common and practical questions about article publishing. Specifically answers: chances for acceptance, selecting a journal, response time, dealing with rejection.

Rodrigues, R.J., & Uhlenberg, D.M. (1978).
Publish? Or perish: The thought? Journal of Teacher Education, 29(4), 64-66.

Reviews research on faculty publishing. Contains a table which recounts rejection rates of education journal (36-98%) and acceptance to publication time (2 months-1 year).

Roskies, E. (1975).
Publish and perish.
American Psychologist, 30(12), 1165-1168.

Recounts the 7+ year path of getting the authors book published. Notes that not all publications are created equal--senior faculty often possess reputations, staff, tricks-of-the-trade, etc.

Sample, S.B. (1972).
Inherent conflict between research and education.
Educational Record, 53(1), 17-22.

Few institutions such as the University of Chicago have openly declared that its primary function is research. State universities have typically declared education of students a priority but privately reward professional work with salaries according to research achievements. In achieving domination of intellectual education over research in educational institutions several points are established: 1. Professors taking courses out of their field, 2. Identify and promote outstanding researchers. 3. Basic research would be an integral part of

the university, but research devoted to intellectual development must be demonstrable. 4. Establishing interdisciplinary program for student and special pay and prerequisites for professors accepting joint appointments.

Scott, S., & Castner, B. (1983).
Reference sources for composition research: A practical survey. College English, 45(8), 756-768.

An excellent survey of bibliographic resources in rhetoric and composition with annotated entries. The survey is divided into two parts, historical rhetoric and current composition research.

Showalter, D.E. (1978).
Publication and stagnation in the Liberal Arts College. Educational Record, 59, 166-172.

Details the differences between the "publish or perish" university and liberal arts colleges. Characterizes faculty who are researchers and avowed cosmopolitans versus the teaching and institutional activity of "locals".

Silverman, R.J. (1984).
Publishing patterns evidenced in the core higher education journals.
Research in Higher Education, 21(2), 159-177.

Eight core higher education journals from 1975 to 1981 resulted in 1,103 articles which were examined. Found that 40% of first authors on articles were from research universities and that only 1.5% of total senior authors are graduate students.

Simpson, R.H. (1975).
Teaching by personal appearance or by print? Improving College University Teaching, 23, 184, 185.

Discusses teaching through print versus teaching by personal appearances before classes.

Smart, J.C., & Elton, C.F. (1981).
Structural characteristics and citation rates of education journals.
American Educational Research Journal, 18(4), 399-413.

A 1978 sample of 148 education journals were examined pursuant to referencing patterns and citations. Found that the core literature (75% of all citations) may be found in a small number of journals and produced a list of these 30 most frequently cited education journals.

Smith, J.H. (1977).
Subvention of scholarly publishing.
Scholarly Publishing, 9(1), 19-29.

Noted a 22% reduction of hardback books published by 61 university presses (1970-1976) because of budgetary problems. Examined parameters of press and institutional policies and practices. Potential solutions offered.

Smith, B.M., & Gough, P.B. (1984).
Editors speak out on refereeing.
Phi Delta Kappan, 65(8), 637-639.

Queried editors of 138 refereed and 38 nonrefereed journals. This excellent and detailed study of a number of differences between refereed and nonrefereed found the only real disparity had to do with the range of material published by journal type. Refereed journals are conservative, mainstream and tend to be negative toward the unusual or controversial. Another important difference is that promotion and tenure committees give higher status to refereed journals.

Smith, R., & Fiedler, F.E. (1971).
The measurement of scholarly work: A critical review of the literature. Educational Record, 52(1), 225-232.

Discusses the measurement and evaluation of scholarly work by examining measures of individual and departmental ratings by scholars, publication quantity and quality awards, productivity, and the quality of the journal in which the article was published. The authors conclude that while an adequate evaluation requires several criteria, it should also include the citation measure because this is "least contaminated" by prestige factors or the sheer numbers of published papers.

Sorcinelli, M.D. (1985).
Profile: The Indiana U Faculty.
Administrator. 4(22), 1-2.

A survey of 112 faculty at Indiana University revealed that not having enough time and time allocation were problems. Teaching and services activities drained time needed for research (time for research primary concern, teaching a secondary concern).

Spithill, A.C. (1973).
To leave a scratch on the wall: Getting published.
Personnel and Guidance Journal, 52(1), 35-38.

Points for beginning writers to get started: sustaining motivation, knowledge, know audience, etc. Explains the Fog Index which measures the complexity of a passage and the educational level one must attain to comprehend the writing.

Staff. (1974, June 14)
In defence of the anonymous referee.
Nature, 249, 601.

Although acknowledging that blind review does not occur in sports, justice, the arts, etc. the writer notes that reviewers should not have to endure irate face-to-face meetings or telephone calls from rejected authors. Some forms of truthfulness and 'readership' opinion would falter without blind reviews.

Stainton, E.M. (1985).
The copy editor.
Scholarly Publishing, 17(1), 55-63.

Examines the role of the copy editor and how they function to make a better book.

Stallings, W.M., & Singhal, S. (1970).
Some observations on the relationships between research productivity and student evaluations of courses and teaching.
The American Sociologist, 5(2), 141-143.

To re-examine and up-date existing research on whether there exists a relationship between quality of teaching and research. Indiana University and the University of Illinois were used to obtain data. Results varied slightly between the two universities indicated a lack of convincing proof that publications are related to good teaching.

Standera, O.L. (1985).
Electronic publishing: Some notes on reader response and costs.
Scholarly Publishing, 16(4), 291-305.

A study conducted at the University of Calgary which compared five different journal formats: 1. line-printer copy (dot matrix), 2. letter quality copy (daisy wheel), 3. conventional journal (typeset, bound), 4. computer-output microfiche (122 frames per fiche), 5. electronic journal (video display

terminal). Presented to 20 professionals who rated conventional journal first, letter-quality second and electronic journal third for legibility, ease of browsing, indexes, and user-friendly procedures. Cost-benefit evaluation resulted in the same ranking. Found that, at least for now, electronic publishing equating to mean less cost was unrealistic.

Strahan, R.F. (1982).
More on JCP publication: Single versus multiple authorship.
Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29(4), 430-431.

From 1954 to 1979 found an increase from 52.4% to 76.7% of incidences of multiple authorship in JCP. Examines a variety of reasons for the rise of multiple authorship: pressure to publish, sharing the work (2 articles better than one), increasing size of academic departments, tendency toward multidisciplinary and interinstitutional work, and editorial policies.

Suppa, R.J., & Zirkel, P.A. (1983).
The importance of refereed publications: A national survey. Phi Delta Kappan, 64(10), 739-740.

A national survey of the institutional representatives of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education was conducted in order to determine the importance refereed publications have on promotion and tenure. The majority surveyed were chairpersons or deans of higher education. A 68% (494) return concluded that refereed journals were important to promotion and tenure but other factors such as the range of the journals audience, scholarly presentations, and overall reputation were important issues.

Surwillo, W.W. (1986).
Anonymous reviewing and the peer-review process.
American Psychologist, 41(2), 218.

Given that blind review where the reviewer knows the name of the author but the author does not know who reviews, or a blind review where neither author nor reviewer is aware of the others identity have problems a third alternative is proposed - where reviewers know who wrote the manuscript and the author is informed who is doing the review.

Taylor, A. (1985)
Improving America's prose. National Forum, 65(4), 2-3, 35.

In recent years all fields of education have become increasingly concerned with careless, jargon-ridden writing. A steady drop in verbal SAT and achievement scores substantiate the 1983 report "A Nation At Risk" that about half of the newly hired English teachers are not qualified to teach. Points for consideration when writing: 1. Writing is good thinking hence clarity is a necessity. 2. Style of writing should be thoughtful not affected. 3. Get the readers attention with sharp details. 4. Writing can be learned.

Tuckman, H.P. & Hagmann, R.E. (1976).
An analysis of the reward structure in two disciplines.
Journal of Higher Education, 47, 447-464.

A comprehensive study which examined the reward structure for economics and education faculty.

Tyron , G.S. (1981).
Publication records of women counselors during the past decade. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28(2), 184-186.

Examines the publication history of females in JCP for 10 years (1969-1979). In 1969 women were 11% of authors, by 1979 women authors had increased to 27%.

Tyron, G.S. (1986).
Getting published: A personal account.
Journal of Counseling and Development, 64(10), 650.

Recounts the path of the authors 31 published articles in 8 years. Nineteen rejected by first journal submitted to, 3 accepted without revision, 9 revised and resubmitted to the same journal. The median from initial submission to publication was 15 months. Found that patience and persistence is rewarded.

Valdehuesa, M.E. (1985).
Publishing for new literates in Asia.
Journal of Reading, 28(7), 632-634.

Discusses the problem of publishing for new literates in Asia and what can be done to alleviate this problem.

Veal, L.R., & Hudson, S.A. (1983).
Direct and indirect measures for large-scale evaluation of writing.
Research in the Teaching of English, 17(3), 290-296.

A study examined 24 high schools in 18 Georgia school systems to evaluate indirect and direct measures of "skills related to writing". The results presented provide for a comparison of the potential validity, reliability and costs of several direct and indirect measures of writing.

Voeks, V.W. (1962).
Publication and teaching effectiveness.
Journal of Higher Education, 33(4), 212-218.

A study to determine if there exists a relationship between quality of teaching and research. Faculty members (n=305) were drawn from 30 departments. Some from each department were chosen from the university Research Society. Eleven chi-squares were run for various relationships between extensiveness of publishing and effectiveness of teaching. Results show that quality of teaching and quality of publishing are independent variables.

Walker, J.R. (1978).
Writing avoidance: A professional approach.
Personnel and Guidance Journal, 57(4), 218-219.

A six-step system to begin academic writing: 1) preliminary mental imagery, 2) conferring/corresponding, 3) planning, 4) cover yourself/anticipate, 5) stimulating writing, and 6) resisting pressure.

Wall, J. (1974).
Getting into print in P & G: How it's done.
Personnel and Guidance Journal, 52(9), 594-602.

Follows the path of a manuscript through the journal editorial process. Provides suggestions as to how authors may help at various stages.

Walton, J.M. (1982).
Research activity and scholarly productivity among counselor educators. Counselor Education and Supervision, 21(4), 305-311.

A total of 255 counselor educators (56.1% return) found 83 high producers (3 or more articles in the last 2 years and 11+ total, or principal investigator, or 3+ monographs or books). Low producers, 172, did not meet criteria. More high producers were

tenured (79.5%), over 45 (53.1%). All indicated time, insufficient reward and poor funding as primary factors preventing scholarly publications. Other results indicate: 66.3% of high producers 11+ years in career, 60% of low preferred teaching (49.3%-high), male high producers (86.7%), full professors (57.8%) high producers, and 54.2% of high producers 5+ hours a week on research, 81.4% of low producers 4 or less hours per week.

Ward, H.W., Hall, B.W., & Schramm, C.F. (1975). Evaluation of published educational research: A national survey. American Educational Research Journal, 12, 109-128.

Comprehensive evaluation research articles found to be of mediocre quality. Shortcomings in areas of procedures, data analysis and summary/conclusions.

Ward, J.W. (1984). How scholars regard university presses. Scholarly Publishing, 16(1), 33-38.

Survey results of 22 (50% return) American Council of Learned Societies delegates concerning how scholars regard university presses. All hold university presses in high regard but express concerns about: pricing policies, publishing high market books to buy opportunity to publish other with low market value, and finding economic alternatives.

Watkins, C.E., Jr. (1982). Writing for publication: Some helpful tips for the school counselor. School Counselor, 29(3), 239-242.

With journal rejection rates as high as 85-90% suggests following "journal etiquette". Should be: a guidelines follower, relevant, novel, interested in and attend to feedback, concise and careful, neat, patient, and willing to revise.

Watkins, C.E., Jr. (1984). Facilitating graduate students' publication efforts: A seminar-sharing approach. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25(1), 76-77.

Ten tips on writing for publication are briefly examined: Own feelings and experiences, own style, types of outlets, publishing modes, class papers, publication query, evaluate published works, willing to risk, practice-persist-revise, and read relevant articles.

Watson, P.D. (1985).
Production of scholarly articles by academic librarians and library school faculty.
College and Research Libraries, 46(4), 335-342.

Examines the affiliation of authors of 1,537 articles published during the period 1979 through 1983 in 11 major library science periodicals. Each article was coded for the institution affiliation of the author and for practicing librarians by the type of library (e.g. public, academic, etc.). For multi-author papers, credit was assigned fractionally to each author. A table identifying library school article productivity by academic rank is provided.

Weaver, F.S. (1982).
Teaching, writing, and developing. Journal of Higher Education, 53(5), 587-592.

The central issue revolves around better college teaching. Professional writing, an often neglected tool by educators, needs to be reconsidered as an avenue necessary to enhance individual and group professionalism. Writing can develop better clarity of teaching methods, heighten self-respect, increase visibility of the institution and strengthen faculty morale by engaging in scholarly issues.

Weisheit, R.A., & Regoli, R.M. (1984).
Ranking journals. Scholarly Publishing, 15(4), 313-325.

With the explosion of reading materials within any given discipline it is becoming increasingly important for the professional to choose carefully the journals they wish to read and affiliate with. Time, expense and scholarly impact are crucial components. Two prominent techniques for ranking journals: the reputation approach and the citation approach.

Welter, R. (1959).
Problems of scholarly publications in the humanities and social sciences. New York: American Council of Learned Societies.

Examines the publishing experience of scholars, university processes and learned journals. Reviews the problem of publishing books with small potential sales.

Winkler, K.J. (1984, November 28).
Scholarly publisher worries about 'confusion in the industry'. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 11-12.

New ways to cut costs, the fast production of knowledge, defense of shrinking markets, and maintaining the quality of scholarship are causing confusion in the publishing industry. Emphasizing speed, doing books in-house, standardizing formats, authors providing camera-ready copy, less editing, and short press runs are possible solutions.

Winston, R.B., Jr. (1985).
A suggested procedure for determining order of authorship in research publications.
Journal of Counseling and Development, 63(8), 515-518.

Details an elaborate weighted point system to aid in determining authorship in research publications. Notes that weights for categories should be a group process and is less important than objective review of the contributions of those included.

Wolf, A.W. (1982).
The manuscript blind review process and the manuscript review board. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 13(3), 4-5.

The steps involved with the blind manuscript review process and details concerning the Editorial Review Board are outlined. JARC finds that 29.6% of manuscripts are accepted for publication, 11% rejected, and 59% returned for further work.

Wolf, A.W. (1983).
A descriptive review of contributors to JARC. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 14(1), 8-10.

Examined contributors to JARC in 1980 and 1982. Found educators accounted for 73% of published articles in 1980 and 59.4% in 1982. Practitioners contributed articles remained constant 24% (1980), 25% (1982). Most rejected manuscript (43.75%) came from practitioners.

Wolper. R.S. (1982).
Why I edit-and keep editing-a journal. Scholarly Publishing, 13(2), 149-155.

A subjective report by a journal editor as to why he edits: nothing requires more patience than proofreading, helping colleagues with publishing, forced to know current scholarship, helps to write better, allows one to give something back to the field, and is a way of joining and continuing a tradition.

Woodring, P. (1981).
Writing about education.
Phi Delta Kappen, 62(7), 500-501.

Academic publishing lacks vigor, interest and style. Suggest: strong opening; visualize audience; brevity-strong verbs, correct nouns; avoid vogue words, euphemisms and jargon; best topic-thoroughly familiar with but new; and rewrite.

Woodring, P. (1982).
Some thoughts on book reviewing.
Phi Delta Kappan, 63(6), 422.

In essence a book reviewer needs to answer the following questions: Are the author's ideas sound? Are they original? Significant or trivial? Do the conclusions logically follow from the evidence presented? Who should read this book? A reviewer should decline analysis of a book if their personal and educational background are not extensive enough to adequately judge the work.

Wright, R.D. (1970).
Truth and its keepers.
New Scientist, 45(690), 402-404.

Discusses unethical and unprofessional actions of some referees. Suggests that reviewers be required to send identified copies of their reviews to authors.

Zebrowski, E., Jr. (1983).
College science textbook publication: A look at the sociological mechanism.
Science Education, 67(4), 443-453.

Finding that the textbook not the teaching method often has the major influence on what students learn in college science courses a sociological examination of textbook publishing was conducted. Role conflict occurs when faculty author becomes as subcontractor to a publishing company. The preselection of author attributes by the publishing company helps them assure that the final product, the textbook, is a compromise of author commitment and publisher goals and priorities.

Zebrowski, E. Jr., & Werner, K. (1984).
Publishing without perishing: Advice for prospective textbook authors.
TETYC, Fall, pp. 52-60.

A 25 step procedure for those wishing to publish a book about a class they teach. Several of the points are most interesting: 4. decide whether to have a co-author, 5. decide on whether you're going to write at home or on campus, 11. don't give up before you've gotten at least four rejections.

Zirkel, P.A. (1978).
Writing for education publications.
Journal of Teacher Education, 29(4), 69.

Thirteen hints (steps) for preparing and submitting manuscripts based on a seminar panel discussion of experts.

Zuckerman, H. (1967).
Nobel laureates in science: Patterns of productivity, collaboration, and authorship.
American Sociological Review, 32(3), 391-403.

A total of 41 Nobel laureates were studied. Found they start to publish earlier and continue longer than a matched sample. Median of 3.9 articles per year compared to 1.4 for matched group. The study examined collaboration and consequences of the prize.